

I am thankful to Ref.1 for his valuable criticism and his suggestions to improve my manuscript. My point-by-point answers follow:

*This is an interesting perspective on encyclopedias from the perspective of the description of lightning and thunder. It contains a range of worthwhile material, and it should be published in HGSS.*

*I have two principal points to make about it. Firstly, the motivation for the work is not clearly enough provided at the outset. For example, the material at L38-41 could be given in the opening sentences of section 1. Secondly, the structure of the article needs to be outlined early on, probably in section 1.*

I added the following sentences at the beginning of Chapter 1:

The motivation of this work was to study the development of descriptions and explanations of lightning and thunder over the past two and a half millennia. A convenient source for this purpose are encyclopedias, since they are supposed to contain the actual knowledge of the respective age which has been accepted by the authorities of the time, relaying often to earlier scholars. Their widespread circulation indicates that the readers appreciated exactly this purpose.

*Currently, the sections are chronological, which is fine. But a guide to what is coming - perhaps even a simple table - would help the reader further.*

At the end of Chapter 1 I added:

Starting with the eminent Greek philosopher Aristotle in Chapter 2, we examine a few Roman enc. and several medieval enc. in Chapters 3 and 4. Chapter 5 deals with enc. of enlightenment and following times, and finally Chapter 6 with online- and a special enc.

*L9 (and L12) "wrong" implies hindsight evaluation - better avoided. Just acknowledge that the medieval view was different to the modern view, and perhaps where it originated.*

in L9 I changed „wrong“ into quite different from the modern view and in L12 „wrong and strange“ into from our present understanding unorthodox.

*L16 Are all details of physical phenomena ever completely understood? It seems unfair to thunderstorm scientist to single them out.*

I changed the sentence to Finally, it is stated that even today several details of thunderstorms are not well understood

*End of Sect 1. Please add a few lines explaining the structure of the paper and how the subsequent sections are organised.*

see above

*L60 Just point out that, at the time, they considered thunder to precede lightning. (The early authors would have had their own reasons, and it is only erroneous by modern investigations).*

I changed the sentence to **Here the most important assumption is that thunder precedes lightning, contrary to the modern view.**

*L95 Only some observations of ball lightning describe its ability to move through walls, so give a reference for this. A useful authoratative reference is Pippard 1982 <https://www.nature.com/articles/298702b0>*

I included the reference and changed the sentence to **... could be a ball lightning, since some observations describe its ability to move through walls (e.g. Pippard 1982):**

*L268 Electricity was described in the terms of the time: a modern judgement on its validity, requiring ions and electrons, is inappropriate here.*

I changed the sentence to **...to former explanations of lightning and thunder, although our modern view of electricity is different.**

*L277 Chree was superintendent of Kew Observatory (see MacDonald, 2018) and therefore a knowledgeable establishment figure. As was Abbe. Having such contributors may have caused a transformative step in quality.*

I added here **... British Professor and superintendent of the famous Kew Observatory Charles Chree**

*L300-309. This seems to be a footnote, or possibly, an endnote. Please be clear about how it links to the other material.*

I cannot follow this suggestion because I think that mentioning the enc. of Fairy Tales is a remarkable supplement to this work. To make this clear I started this section with: **In order to supplement the so far treated enc with a completely different, non-natural science perspective of our phenomena, a brief excursus to the ENCYCLOPEDIA OF FAIRY TALES is included. It is a German enc...**

*L310. This needs to be identified as a separate section, for Online Encyclopedias. There is a point to be made about distributed authorship, in comparison with the authorships of the earlier material. Distributed authorship brings other issues - sometimes Wikipedia articles are poor and dominated by the erroneous views of one or a few non-expert individuals.*

I started a new section here with: **6. Online Encyclopedias and a „Special Encyclopedia“**

**It should be emphasized that online enc. have a distributed authorship, quite different from the enc. treated so far where the authors are known. This means that WIKIPEDIA articles can contain questionable views of individuals.**

*Minor points*

*L23 Encyclopedia*

*L31 angel*

*L152 Worth mentioning...*

*L216 speed (not distance)*

*L237 ...of environmental physics*

*L347 Boys (The originator's name was Charles Vernon Boys).*

**All corrected**